narrow limits should enable gentlemen like the Member who are interested in the community to produce evidence easily to show that the feeling is widespread.

Member.—I shall submit a memorial.

Dewan.—You must first of all satisfy Government by means of evidence that there is a general feeling in the community on this point.

27. Jenmies and Kudians; some defects in the existing Regulation and suggestions for remedying them.

Mr. Nilakantaru Nilakantaru (Member, Jenmi, Kottayam Division) urged that early steps might be taken for the Bill amending the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation, which had already been promised by Government, being introduced into the Legislative Council, as the existing Regulation, V of 1071, did not satisfy either the Jenmies or the Kudiyans. He pointed out that the provisions of the Land Conservancy Regulation had been misapplied in the case of Jenmies and Kudiyans by low-paid revenue officials, which resulted in hardship to both parties. The banks of rivers which had all along been under occupation, but which at the time of the Settlement were not registered in the names of the occupants, were now declared *poramboke* and the Jenmies who had demised the adjoining lands on Kanom to Kudiyans could not consequently recover the *pattom* and *michavarom* due to them from the latter in full. He instanced a portion of the land belonging to the Puzhakkara temple in the Muvattupuzha taluk as having been recently declared *poramboke* in the face of evidence to the contrary. The Member prayed for relief from this kind of trouble.

Dewan's reply.—The Member has not made any mention of *poramboke* proceedings in the memorandum of subjects which he has submitted. I have already given my reply on this point in answer to representations made by other Members. In regard to the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation, I am sorry that my expectations have not been realised. At the last session of the Assembly I said that we would be in a position to introduce the Bill in the Council in a few months. But both Mr. Subba Aiyar and the Government have had so much of urgent legislative work to get through that this Regulation has had necessarily to wait. The Bill will be introduced soon after the new Legislative Council is formed. Under the rules, the Bill will be published in advance in the Gazette for information and public criticism.

28. Undesirability of abolishing the Magistrate's Court at Tovala.

Mr. Kanakku Maharaja Pillai Sivatanu Pillai (Member, Tovala Taluk) said that in the Tovala taluk there were formerly three Magistrates' Courts, viz., those at Azhakiapandipuram, Aramboly and Bhutapandi, while at present there was only one Magistrate's Court, viz., that at Bhutapandi. If this Magistrate's Court was also to be abolished, it would result in great hardship to the people, as the people of Tovala would have to travel about 20 miles to reach Nagercoil which would then be the nearest Magistrate's Court for them. The Member, therefore, requested that, if it was finally decided to abolish the Magistrate's Court at Bhutapandi, at least a Munsiff-Magistrate's Court might be established there, as also a Village Panchayat Court and a Bench Magistrate's Court when the Magisterial work was found heavy.

Dewan's reply.—In regard to the request for a Munsiff's Court, Government will consult the High Court. In regard to the Magistrate's Court, Government have not yet settled the question of re-distribution of taluks finally, and your representation in the matter will receive due consideration.

29. Undesirability of distributing the magisterial work of the Nedumangad taluk among the Magistrates of other taluks.

Mr. M. Subrahmanya Pillai (Member, Nedumangad Taluk), while feeling gratified at the action of Government in having granted an English school to the people of Nedumangad and removed the confusion in the matter of the registry of *puduvals* there, expressed dissatisfaction at the proposed abolition of the Magistrate's Court in that taluk. The taluk had 16 *pakuthies* containing over a lakh and eleven thousand inhabitants, and the people were groaning under difficulties in respect of civil suits.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

and were repeatedly asking for the establishment of a Munsiff's Court. It was, therefore, a source of additional hardship to them that they were going to be deprived of even the Magistrate's Court which they possessed at present. The inhabitants of the *pakuthies* the criminal jurisdiction of which was proposed to be shifted to Neyyattinkara would be put to positive inconvenience and the same was the case with the areas proposed to be shifted for the purposes of magisterial jurisdiction to the other taluks. In point of criminal work too, the Member stated that there were not sufficient arrears to warrant a change of magisterial jurisdiction. The appointment of an Assistant Tahsildar and the separation of the Devaswom work from the Revenue Department would make the magisterial work of the Tahsildar too heavy to be managed by him. For the above reasons the Member requested that the magisterial work of the taluk should not be distributed among the Magistrates of the other taluks. He also prayed for the establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Nedumangad, at least as a tentative measure for a period of three years.

30. Undesirability of abolishing the Magistrate's Court at Pattanapuram.

Mr. Padmanabha Pillai Kochukunju Pillai (Member, Pattanapuram Taluk) represented that most of the inhabitants of the taluk were very poor, that to compel them to go to Shencottah—a place about 50 miles off—in connection with their criminal cases was very hard, and that revenue matters were not of such serious consequence to the public as magisterial matters which touched both their personal safety and the safety of their property more intimately. He, therefore, suggested that the Magistrate's Court at Punalore might be continued there and that, if funds were needed for the purpose, the same might be obtained by the reduction of a few *pakuthies* in the taluk.

Dewan's reply.—I shall give a joint reply to the two Members. The matter is still under consideration. No final decision has been arrived at. All the points referred to by the two Members will be considered.

31. Desirability of divesting Revenue Officers of their magisterial powers and placing the Magistrates under the supervision of the High Court.

Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman (Member, Muvattupuzha Taluk) referred in laudatory terms to the recent policy pursued by Government in giving a non-official majority to the Legislative Council and in widening the franchise. The announcement made in the opening address of the Dewan about the separation of the Devaswoms from the Land Revenue Department would also be gratefully received by the public, as the proposed measure would result in the separation of the Revenue and the Magisterial functions—a subject on which he spoke last year also. The Member's view was that the separation would not involve the State in any additional expenditure and that, on the other hand, the work of the Revenue Department and the Magistracy would be done more efficiently and promptly and to the greater convenience of the people. At present the litigant public were being put to considerable hardship and inconvenience on account of parties and their witnesses having to accompany the Tahsildars in their official tours. The Member, therefore, recommended the separation of magisterial work from revenue officers and the placing of the Magistrates under the direct control of the High Court.

Dewan's reply.—There is no difference between the Government and the Member as regards the soundness of the policy suggested by him. But he cannot overlook the fact that there are some practical difficulties in giving full effect to his suggestions. The Government will do their best to give effect to this policy as far as possible.

32. Some suggestions for the better administration of justice, civil and criminal.

Mr. V. R. Gopala Pillai (Member, Kunnatnad Taluk) began by referring to the delay which was a general feature of the work of civil courts in the State. He pointed out that more than a period of 3 years was taken for the disposal of even simple original cases. The main reason for this delay was the failure to serve processes in time. There was similar delay in the case of execution applications also. The Member suggested that, if courts would allow interest at 12 per cent for the plaint amount after the institution of the suit and a similar rate of interest on costs

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly